

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6, 11-13, 18, 23, 38, and 40 have been amended solely for clarity. Thus, claims 1-45 are pending, although claims 7-9, 19-21, 30, 32-37, 39-41, and 43-45 are pending and withdrawn.<sup>1</sup>

Claims 1-2, 4, 10-14, 16, 22-24, 38, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Oakes et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0063498) in view of Yue (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0203354). Claims 4, 10, 16, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Oakes in view of Yue and further in view of Burr (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0079003). Claims 3, 15, and 25-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Oakes in view of Yue and Burr, and further in view of Bluetooth Specification version 1.0B (available online). Claims 5 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Oakes in view of Yue and Burr, and further in view of Darling et al. (WO 93/23125). These § 103 rejections are once again respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner is thanked for providing the “Response to Arguments” section bridging pages 2-3 of the Final Office Action. The main argument advanced in this section appears to be that Yue presents a list that identifies which device is a master and which device is a slave. In this regard, this portion of the Final Office Action cites to paragraph 22 of Yue for the apparent proposition that any of Bluetooth devices A, B, and C can be designated a master device or a

---

<sup>1</sup> The Examiner is once again kindly requested to confirm the status of the claims, as the present Office Action Summary seems to suggest that the withdrawn claims have been cancelled rather than merely withdrawn, which is incorrect.

slave device from the remote device 150. This can be accomplished using a list, which list may include current and/or previous “pairings.”

As Applicant has previously explained, however, Yue does not fit neatly into the parent/child model recited in the claims. Indeed, as Applicant has previously explained, Yue relates to using a first Bluetooth device as an intermediary or relay between a second Bluetooth device and a remote device. In any event, even though the Final Office Action is correct in noting that the Bluetooth devices in Yue can be designated either master devices or slave devices, what is missing is the recognition that the selection of whether a device is designated a master device or a slave device is performed on the remote device 150. Thus, even if one could draw a mapping between Yue and the inventions defined by the independent claims, Yue still would not make up for the admitted deficiencies of Oakes (the primary reference) because the master/slave designation in Yue is performed on the remote device 150 -- not on the slave devices.

Indeed, the claims make clear that it is the child device that includes a display for displaying parent device information of the parent devices existing within the communicable range, based on said parent device packets received by said receiver, said displayed parent device information being configured to include information of a plurality of parent devices. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that Yue disclosed parent devices and child devices (i.e., corresponding to Yue’s master devices and slave devices, respectively), Yue would necessarily fail to disclose displaying information about the parent devices on the child devices. Once again, as paragraph 22 of Yue makes clear, the designation of a device as either a master device or a slave device is performed on the remote device 150 -- not on a child device. As such, Yue fails to make up for

the admitted deficiencies with respect to Oakes. The Final Office Action's reasoning simply is not technically accurate in this regard.

Without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejections, Applicant has amended the independent claims to recite additional subject matter which is not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. In particular, the independent claims now make clear that the parent device information or parent device list that is communicated to and displayable on the child device includes information pertaining to the user using the parent device and/or the game being played on the parent device. Such features are not present in the prior art, alone or in combination. Applicant respectfully submits that the § 103 rejections should be reversed for at least this further reason.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the invention defined by the amended claims herein is not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Thus, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions, please do not hesitate to call the undersigned attorney at the phone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By: 

Raymond Y. Mah  
Reg. No. 41,426

RYM:jr  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100